

*Income Tax Act*

House. I invite the hon. member who has the floor to take note of the remarks of the hon. member for Mississauga South.

**Mr. Skelly:** Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the fact that my preamble is somewhat lengthy, but I would remind the hon. member that I did mention the income tax at the beginning of my remarks. However, in all seriousness I am coming to the point quickly. I would just like to mention some of the services which are required by people in order to earn their income. We are talking about legislation which removes taxation in an area, and our purpose is to provide services. I will come to the point in just a moment, but I beg your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, to allow me to continue.

I was speaking about the economy of this area and the problem which the government has in assisting people to build up the local economy. In this case the government has the responsibility to designate that airport. The hon. member for Burlington spoke at great length about small businesses. Let me point out that this community is attempting to establish small businesses and to employ people locally. Without an airport this will not happen, and the seven businesses which are in place will disappear.

The basic problem is that on the other island where there are 50 people an airport is already in progress and government funding may be allocated there. There is a great danger that in the future the 50 people in that community might find that bankruptcies will drive everyone away from that area. What we have is a government funded airport, and 1,200 people on another island being forced to depend on that. The hospital is located on Campbell Island and so is the RCMP, and the total population is being made to suffer because of the totally inadequate transportation system.

At the beginning of my remarks I intended to speak briefly on this subject. I listened to hon. members preceding me make speeches about small business. Having laid the groundwork, I will reserve my remarks relating to the Income Tax Act to other clauses. Thank you for your indulgence, Mr. Chairman.

**Mr. Siddon:** Mr. Chairman, I certainly noted your tolerance with respect to the previous speaker. I will try to be somewhat more relevant in addressing my remarks to some of the injustices and difficulties which my constituents have experienced with the income tax system. I wish to put forward in particular a few ideas which might emerge in the form of amendments as the committee proceeds to the clause by clause debate on Bill C-54.

However, I cannot help but observe, in reacting to the previous speaker, that here we have a party which is apparently intent on enhancing opportunities on behalf of small businesses and its members pretend to advocate increased government attention to small business, yet at the same time they are saying that ownership, and the enjoyment of ownership of property should be denied—

**Mr. Skelly:** Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I should like to call attention to the hon. member who has the

floor that we do not pretend to support small business. In my area, the government of which he was a member—

**The Chairman:** The hon. member for Richmond-South Delta has the floor. The hon. member for Comox-Powell River had his opportunity to make a speech and he can do so again, if he wishes, later.

**Mr. Siddon:** I do appreciate the latitude which you, Mr. Chairman, granted the previous speaker. It is of interest to note that that party, which pretends to advocate support for small business, is intent on denying Canadians, along with their pet sheep across the way, the enjoyment and the ownership of property. They know full well, on a matter that is currently before the House and high in the minds of all of us, that the concerns of the provinces, including the province of Prince Edward Island, could have been accommodated by the same kinds of "notwithstanding" clauses or limitations which are inserted in the constitutional resolution in relation to a number of other special rights and privileges that have been granted.

I am also impressed by the implications of this tendency to nationalization on the whole of our country and its economy. That includes the income tax system. If the NDP and their pet sheep have their way, we will not need to have an income tax system. We will be able to dispense with this very tedious Bill C-54 as well as with the Income Tax Act because there will be no income being earned, the resources of the country will be allotted by the central government, no one will get any pay, and favours will be dispensed in the form of patronage to friends of the party in office. That is how it works in Russia. I have been there and seen it. Those who are good workers for the Communist party get all the breaks, and the rest live like serfs. There is no need to pay income tax or to concern oneself with an income tax act.

Before I leave this subject I would just like to quote a statement which the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources is reported to have made in Alberta on the weekend. Apparently the minister said this:

"Provinces don't own resources like your own home", Lalonde explained to one group at Bonnyville. "And provinces don't own the resources the way Libya and Saudi Arabia own theirs."

● (1630)

That can be coupled with the courtship between the party on my left and the party opposite in relation to the question of private ownership of property. I might go beyond including ownership of title to land by also including ownership of businesses, homes, automobiles and everything in our society. I submit that these members of Parliament are directing the country toward a new system of government in which we will not need an Income Tax Act and we will not have to spend long hours, as we are today, trying to achieve equity and fairness for the free citizens of this country, at least those who considered themselves to be free until the advent of the current constitutional debate.